DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 544 EA 021 166

AUTHOR Hansen, Sue; And Others
TITLE Inviting School Success in Hawaii.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *College School Cooperation; Cooperation; Coordination; *Core Curriculum; *Educational Development; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; High Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Hawaii; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines the structure underlying the School Success Project in Hawaii, a group working for school renewal using the partnership structure developed by John Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal and Hawaii-developed strategies for school success. The advantages of the partnership concept are discussed, and then details of the partnership processes applied to a high school in the suburbs of Honolulu are provided. The school plans to have the four core subject teachers working together with the same group of students, a process sometimes known as "coring." (7 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309544

AERA CONFERENCE , MARCH 1989

SAN FRANCISCO

INVITING SCHOOL SUCCESS IN HAWAII

by

Sue Hansen, Arthur R. King Jr., and Thomas Stone,

University of Hawaii

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sue Hansen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 166

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INVITING SCHOOL SUCCESS IN HAWAII

INTRODUCTION

School renewal is a complex and delicate task. To have any chance of success, the proposed changes must meet the needs of the school, have the support of a critical mass of staff and, ideally, be generated by school personnel, with appropriate support from personnel from the district, state and university.

This paper outlines the structures underlying the School Success Project in Hawaii, a group working for school renewal using the partnership structure developed by John Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal and Hawaii-developed strategies for school success. It looks at the advantages of the partnership concept, and then details the partnership processes applied to a high school in the suburbs of Honolulu. The school plans to have the four core subject teachers working together with the same group of students, a process sometimes known as "coring", "schools-within-a-school" or "house plan", and in this paper to be referred to as coring. Many of the structures and processes used are consistent with the principles of invitational learning identified by Purkey and Novak (1984).

The development of the partnership in Hawaii comes at an opportune time. Public schools in Hawaii appear more open to the idea of school renewal now than they have ever been. The Hawaii Department of Education is a single, state-wide school system with seven administrative sub-districts. Their initiatives in establishing school climate committees have been percolating quietly for some time, but now the fire is stoked with the recent publication of the Berman Report - a report instigated by the Hawaii business community - advising, among other things, site-based management for schools, and incentives for schools to create schools-within-a-school (coring).

THE STRUCTURE OF THE HAWAII SCHOOL SUCCESS PROJECT

History

John Goodlad's extensive study of schooling and the resultant book, A Place Called School, (1984), described the complexity of the situation in American schools today, and highlighted the great need for educational renewal. In September 1985, Goodlad created the Center for Educational Renewal within the College of Education at the University of Washington.

One of its major goals was to develop the strategy of using a partnership between schools and universities to both renew schools and educate educators. By April 1987, fourteen partnerships from across the nation constituted the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), based at the University of Washington under Goodlad's direction. The NNER provides an opportunity for national collaboration, support and sharing of ideas, plus linking different agencies and thereby giving added access to the accumulating knowledge of educational change practitioners.

Principles behind the National Network for Educational Renewal (Clark, Heckman and Wilson, 1988):

- Equal access to knowledge for all students should guide the creation of educational settings.
- Meaningful change in the schools will not occur if we only do better what we are doing now. We need to change dramatically what we do in schools.
- The school should be the center of decision-making, change and renewal.
- Creating conditions for empowering ourselves and others promotes meaningful change. This differs from installing innovations.
- Working on our own problems requires us to learn from others. This differs from making recommendations for others or replicating someone's model.

- It is possible for schools and universities to work as equal partners simultaneously to renew schooling and educate educators.
- Schools and colleges of education are different cultures which, in the past, have had their own turf. In order to work together productively, both have to share turf.
- Schools and universities do have overlapping self-interest which can be best met through cooperative efforts.
- A vital aspect of change and renewal is ongoing critical inquiry which means examining what we do and why we do it. This includes a willingness to ask ourselves difficult questions, such as whose interests are being served and why, and to explore new possibilities for what can be.

The Hawaii School/University Partnership

The Hawaii School/University Partnership is comprised of the State Department of Education, the College of Education of the University of Hawaii at Manoa, and the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate.

Within the Department of Education, the superintendents of two school districts on the island of Oahu chose to be part of the partnership. Prior to the establishment of the partnership, the Department of Education had initiated a variety of moves which indicated an interest in school renewal and concern for students educationally at risk. They had mandated the formation of school coordinating councils in each school. These councils are comprised of an administrator, teachers, students, parents and community members,and have as one of their goals the improvement of the school climate. Some districts have also mandated the establishment of school climate committees to further facilitate school-based change to improve school climate. A Task Force was appointed to report on the characteristics and needs of students educationally at risk, and the publication of this report generated much interest.

The Kamehameha Schools are operated by the Bishop Estate, as part of the will of the last Hawaiian Royalty, to provide for the education of native Hawaiian children. In addition to a K-12 school, it has many outreach

services to the public schools and an extensive educational research arm aimed at the needs of native Hawaiian children but applicable to many of the problems and needs of other educationally at risk children.

The University of Hawaii participation is led by the Curriculum Research and Development Group (CRDG), a group within the College of Education which runs the University Laboratory School (K-12) and conducts research, development, and school support activities in many aspects of the curriculum. The CRDG and the University Laboratory School have for many years promoted the efficacy of a long-term and sequential curriculum and the importance of equal educational opportunity and access for all students. CRDG staff, many of whom are also teachers at the Lab School, have been and are developing sequential, long-term curriculum, and implementing them at the Lab School.

These three organizations, all already strongly involved, but working separately, in various aspects of school renewal and the needs of educationally at risk students, made a five-year commitment to work closely together as equal partners. From this partnership, three task forces were formed: the School Success Project: At-Risk Prevention and Mainstreaming; Teacher Training; and Principal Training. This paper concerns the School Success Project: At-Risk Prevention and Mainstreaming.

The School Success Project

This task force was originally called the Student At-Risk Project, but was retitled the School Success Project. Much advance publicity and expectation is generated by a name, and it was believed that the words "at-risk" gave a disinviting message. Those who were at-risk understandably did not like to be so labelled, and others who were not at-risk, but who, through the project's principle of whole school renewal, came into contact with the term were often suspicious and somewhat anxious about the possibility of being thought at-risk. The current name is both more inviting and more in accord with the project's aims of educational renewal. This renewal is approached by working with administrators and teachers in a handful of pilot schools to help them generate change suitable to their own needs, philosophies, and

services to the public schools and an extensive educational research arm aimed at the needs of native Hawaiian children but applicable to many of the problems and needs of other educationally at risk children.

The University of Hawaii participation is led by the Curriculum Research and Development Group (CRDG), a group within the College of Education which runs the University Laboratory School (K-12) and conducts research, development, and school support activities in many aspects of the curriculum. The CRDG and the University Laboratory School have for many years promoted the efficacy of a long-term and sequential curriculum and the importance of equal educational opportunity and access for all students. CRDG staff, many of whom are also teachers at the Lab School, have been and are developing sequential, long-term curriculum, and implementing them at the Lab School.

These three organizations, all already strongly involved, but working separately, in various aspects of school renewal and the needs of educationally at risk students, made a five-year commitment to work closely together as equal partners. From this partnership, three task forces were formed: the School Success Project: At-Risk Prevention and Mainstreaming; Teacher Training; and Principal Training. This paper concerns the School Success Project: At-Risk Prevention and Mainstreaming.

The School Success Project

This task force was originally called the Student At-Risk Project, but was retitled the School Success Project. Much advance publicity and expectation is generated by a name, and it was believed that the words "at-risk" gave a disinviting message. Those who were at-risk understandably did not like to be so labelled, and others who were not at-risk, but who, through the project's principle of whole school renewal, came into contact with the term were often suspicious and somewhat anxious about the possibility of being thought at-risk. The current name is both more inviting and more in accord with the project's aims of educational renewal. This renewal is approached by working with administrators and teachers in a handful of pilot schools to help them generate change suitable to their own needs, philosophies, and

resources, with the ultimate intent of developing strategies for use throughout the state

The Power of the Partnership

A strength of the Hawaii School Success Project has been the partnership concept, which has brought together people already working separately, within their own organizations, in the field of school renewal and answering the needs of the at risk student, given them a chance to collaborate outside their organizations, and at the same time provided a strong public face. The director and two co-directors, all of whom have extensive and varied experience in their own areas, find the collaboration stimulating, energizing, and a major source of support. Although the Department of Education Task Force report defined the areas of need, no coherent plan of implementation had been developed. The second part of this paper details the evolution, to date, of implementation of strategies for school renewal in one of the pilot schools.

When approaching a school, it is effective to have all project personnel make the initial presentation to the total school staff. In this case, numbers, and the combined power and expertize of the three partnership organizations, aid credibility! Generally much of the early work is done by one or two members, but the others are available to offer advice and support. All act as consultants in their particular fields of expertise, and work cooperatively on larger projects.

Efforts such as the retreat day, August 1988, for "Suburban High School" and the January 1989 conference with John Goodlad can be presented with far more impact using the joint resources of the three organizations. The January conference also created a valuable forum for interaction among personnel from the three partnership organizations who had not previously been involved in the partnership. This is something which might not otherwise occur, given the tendency of large organizations to become sufficient within themselves.

At a recent National Network for Educational Renewal meeting, the Hawaii School Success Project learnt of a middle school in California which has undergone substantial renewal during the past three years. This school reorganized to group students with the same "core" (English, Social Studies, Science and Mathematics) of teachers. By having their students in common, the four teachers consult, support, and plan together to address the needs of their students. With the support of the Partnership, the principal and a lead teacher attended the January conference in Hawaii. They gave a presentation to the whole conference and on another day worked at a project school with teachers interested in implementing a "core" program.

The Uniqueness of Each School

A major philosophy in the Goodlad concept of school renewal is that each school is unique and must, with the help and support of experts, decide on a plan of renewal to meets its own needs. That this seemingly obvious idea needs to be stated might seem surprising until one considers the vast number of programs that are either mandated for schools or are incorporated into schools in a fully-developed form, a form that was either developed for a specific situation or, worse, developed for "all" schools.

When teachers are invited and encouraged to examine their own school , and devise a plan, or series of plans, to build on strengths and eliminate weaknesses, they are being given a powerful message. They are being told that they are "able, valuable and responsible" (Purkey and Novak, 1984). They are being cooperatively involved in a process, and their "relatively untapped potential" (Purkey and Novak, 1984) -- in this case to diagnose the problem and develop and/or adapt solutions -- is being recognized and used. The process of school renewal becomes a process of professional renewal and personal empowerment for those who choose to be involved. There is a feeling of control over professional destiny. Energy and enthusiasm increase, and this tends to be contagious. Often other, initially less enthusiastic staff members, find that they want to be involved in a process which they had expected would make their lives more complicated but now can be seen to be a positive and energizing experience.

The School Success Project is working with two high schools and their ten feeder schools to effect school renewal and encourage the schools to develop a critical mass of strategies for school success. Using the "action research" approach, the commitment of those most directly involved is encouraged, outside-the-school expertise is sought, and new information and new insights are brought into the school situation. The action research approach is consistent with contemporary "school-based" methods of educational development and it integrates design, decision-making, and training with evaluation and research.

SCHOOL SITE PROGRAM

A better sense of the school renewal process can be gained by looking at the steps through which one large high school in Hawaii is renewing itself with the help of the School Success Project.

Suburban High School

"Suburban High" has a student population of slightly over 2000, housed in buildings originally designed to accommodate 1400. It is currently one of the largest high schools in the state, and draws students from a wide socio-economic range. The ethnic composition of the school is mixed, as is normal in Hawaii, with 32% of students Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian, 25% Japanese, 13% white, 8% Filipino, and the remaining 22% comprised of Portuguese, Indo-Chinese, Chinese, Spanish, Puerto-Rican, Korean, Samoan, black and others.

As with almost every public high school in Hawaii, this school suffers from having many of the best students drawn off to the private schools. Nevertheless the school has a strong gifted and talented program which provides the school with extra teaching staff, but draws even more of the most able students from the regular classrooms. The school calculates that they have 35-45% of serious, college-bound students, and take pride in their scholastic, sport, dramatic, and musical successes.

There is still, however, a sense of a school under siege. There are an estimated 20% of students who achieve very poorly, and it is these who cause the most upset in the school and who the school feels it is failing. The present principal has been at the school two years. Before his arrival, truancy was major problem, and students reportedly came and went from classes as they felt inclined. His first priority was to reestablish control in this area, and this has been achieved. Now he and many of his staff are looking for bigger changes.

Initial Contact - the Orientation Phase

Initial contact with Suburban High involved five or six meetings between project personnel, the principal, vice-principals, and the counselors. These meetings were basically exploratory on all sides. The first meeting with the full staff took place a few weeks before summer vacation in 1988. It was an after-school meeting and the staff were tired. School Success Project personnel had expected to have the full thirty minutes of the meeting for their introductory presentation, but the first fifteen minutes were taken up with routine school business and the following introduction of the team was brief and neutral in tone, almost as an after-thought.

It was not an auspicious beginning, and Project personnel were reminded of the traditional suspicion of the classroom teacher for the academic who does not actually have to teach adolescents. Part of the introductory presentation was a brief and enthusiastic outline of the advantages of the coring system given by one member of the Project. Teacher reaction was little short of hostile, and there was much playing with car keys and general restlessness as the planned finishing time approached. School Success Project personnel, aware of the general unrest and union contracts, were careful not to keep the school staff beyond this time.

The second visit, a week or two later, was more promising. Some teachers had questions on issues that worried them, and many were fearful that they would return to school in September to find all kinds of changes had been implemented in their absence. School Success Project personnel were able to

allay their worries and reassure them that this was not a situation where District level and university "experts" were going to come in and tell them what to do or implement changes without consultation. At the same time, the team reminded the school staff that an organized, committed school could present a more successful program for the large group of unsuccessful students in the school. The partnership's school renewal process was not a top-down approach, but rather a sharing of expertise and ideas, and support for change, with decision-making being made at the school level by all concerned.

At the end of this meeting, staff who were interested in being involved in some sort of change were asked to sign up. Thirty of the one hundred and thirteen teachers signed. After the previous meeting, this was encouraging! Additionally, a handful of staff stayed afterwards to discuss matters of interest to them, and in the brainstorming session which followed, the subject of coring was presented again. One teacher, MK, a social studies specialist and football coach, was particularly interested. Discussion between him and the resource teacher led to the discovery of an interesting fact. The resource teacher, who was the school's statistician, had found a very high proportion of academic failure among ninth graders. This was amplified by MK, who had noticed that the junior varsity football team, mostly composed of ninth graders, each year lost about one third of its players to the 2.0 rule, which made a player ineligible to play if his grade point average for the year fell below 2.0. This did not occur in the varsity team because, by that stage the players were well known to their coaches, who consequently were able to give their players solid support, monitor their academic progress, and encourage them if their work began to slip.

Retreat Day - Whole School Needs Assessment and Commitment

A complete day of discussion, held in a Waikiki hotel and funded by the district office and the school principal, was held for all staff prior to students returning to school for the fall semester. The agenda and style of the meeting was the result of extensive discussion and planning by the school leadership group and the project staff. Not only did this day give the District superintendant the first chance to speak to the staff about District

committment to school renewal and the needs of those educationally at risk, and the principal a chance to really support this, but it lead to a sense of camaraderie between staff, optimism for the oncoming year, and a feeling of delight at being treated as professionals.

Research has indicated that a critical mass of basic elements are generally found in schools, or programs within schools, which are operating with a high degree of success. The main item on the agenda for the retreat day was the presentation to the staff of an extensive list of these strategies, compiled by School Success Project personnel and approved by the school's leadership team. Opportunity was given for general discussion of the list, and then each staff member indicated which strategies he or she considered most important.

Strategies for Improving School Success:

A. Strategies for the Regular School program--Academic:

1. An organized, sequential, long-term curriculum.
2. A balanced curriculum among the major fields of knowledge and knowing, coupled with a rich and varied set of instructional approaches.
3. Extra teaching, tutoring, and individual support and assistance.
5. Continuous flow of information on progress.
6. Heterogeneous grouping.
7. Coordination of supplementary programs with the regular program.
8. Diagnostic and clinical services.

B. Strategies for the Regular School Program--Personal:

1. Expectation of achievement and school success.
2. Small, personalized working environments.
3. Health information and services.
4. Guidance and counseling instruction and services.
5. Transition into and out of the school.
6. Extra-curricula activities.

C. **Strrategies for Working with the Family:**

1. Positive, consistent messages to students from home and school.
2. Services to teens with their own children.
3. Educating future parents.
4. Services to parents, as in the Parent Networking Centers.

D. **Strategies for Working with the Community:**

1. Coordination with agencies that service student and family.
2. Encourage Big Brother, Big Sister, and similar programs.
3. Participate in community-based, after-school, and summer programs.

Given the chance to rate each strategy according to whether they viewed it as being very important, of some importance, or of little importance in their school, the following percentages of the 110 staff members present rated the following categories as "very important":

83% - the development of an organized, sequential, long-term curriculum
80% - the development of a balanced curriculum among the major fields of knowledge and knowing, coupled with a rich and varied set of instructional approaches
79% - creating small, personalized working environments
79% - ensuring that students receive positive and consistent messages from home and school
77% - staff communicating expectations of achievement and school success to all students,
74% - provision of extra teaching, tutoring, and individual support and assistance for students.
56% - development of appropriate evaluation and grading.
55% - ensuring a continuous flow of information on progress.
54% - coordination with agencies that service student and family.
53% - improved guidance and counseling instruction and services.

52% - provision for educating future parents.
41% - improved transition into and out of the school.
40% - improved diagnostic and clinical services.
39% - coordination of supplementary programs with the regular program.
38% - provision of extracurricular activities.
38% - participation in community-based, after-school, and summer programs.
32% - encouraging Big Brother, Big Sister, and similar programs.
32% - provision of services to teens with their own children.
32%. - improved health information and services.
31% - improved services to parents, as in Parent Networking Centers.
17% - reorganizing classes into heterogeneous groupings.

The high percentages in favor of these strategies for change (with the exception of heterogeneous grouping), were seen by School Success Project personnel as an indication that the staff were able to identify with those strategies, and that further involvement with the school would have some chance of success. The reaction to heterogeneous grouping was disappointing to the leadership groups in the Project and the school, but not unexpected, as most teachers expressed an attitude of "Well, I like the idea, but not in my class, thank you."

The "Alternative Drummer": Participation by the School Support Project support team

After the retreat, one of the School Success Project co-directors, a University of Hawaii staff member, began attending School Climate Committee meetings, as well as the lunchtime meetings of the interested teachers and invited department heads. His attendance at meetings and his energy and enthusiasm, as well as his knowledge of much of the recent research, made him an important resource.

This co-director has become, in fact, what John Goodlad calls "the alternative drummer," and sees as a vital part of the school renewal process. This is the

person who can offer a different, outside, view of the school, ask questions, stimulate discussions, and provide a critical but supportive addition to the school renewal process. Suburban High's "alternative drummer" presented the school with the following research collated from national programs planned to personalize education.

Rationale for Personalizing Education through Core Teachers Planning Together

The transition from one school to another is difficult.
Moving up from one school to the next is often hard for students and their parents, and their difficulties have long troubled teachers, counselors, and administrators. When students make the change from familiar to unfamiliar surroundings, from a nearby school to a distant one, from a small school to a big one, from a circle of friends to a circle of strangers, from self-contained classrooms to departmentalized classrooms, they must concentrate on coping with the unknown and adapting to their new environment and new relationships. This concentration distracts them from concentrating on schooling. The problem is exacerbated for "at-risk" students whose homes lack the structure and stability and guidance they need for learning how to cope with change. School people must find ways to ease this transition by offering a more supportive environment with more personal attention and more humane structures and procedures.

Bigness abets alienation, depersonalization, and disorder. For a time "bigger is better" was the theme, and experts applauded big consolidated schools as more efficient. But the size of many secondary schools has worried educators for the last decade. Recent studies have shown—and common sense confirms—that increased size leads to depersonalization, alienation, and loss of control over one's environment and one's life. For the teacher, big schools can reduce their commitment and sense of responsibility for the school and its goals. For the student, big schools often reduce the sense of belonging and being known, and consequently, their self-esteem. For administrators, big schools, without a supportive infrastructure, reduce

their potential for effective leadership. For parents, big schools are more likely to be unapproachable and confusing.

To address the difficulties of transition and the problems of excessive size, some schools are organizing students into smaller clusters, each assigned to a group of teachers who plan together as a team. This type of organization goes by many names: house plan, school-with-a-school, subschools, little schools, mini-schools, pods, clusters, coring, or team planning. The house plan for school organization decentralizes authority by creating smaller schools-within-a-school. In these smaller units, schooling can become more personal without sacrificing the advantages of a large school's facilities and programs. A house plan creates a way for groups of teachers to cooperate in planning, teaching, and learning. This model is based on a philosophy of nonsegregation. Because students are randomly assigned to each house, they are a cross-section of the whole school population.

Stability, familiarity, and consistency give students the structure they need. Common sense dictates that when stability, familiarity, and consistency are increased, students feel secure and are better able to attend to the purpose of schooling. The house plan fosters the success of students and teachers by providing stability in everyday routines, familiarity with classmates and teachers, and consistency in discipline, homework, classroom management, and accountability throughout the school day. Furthermore, collaboration among a small group of teachers makes feasible a coordinated, sequential curriculum and flexibility in scheduling. It also facilitates the identification and use of inside and outside school resources.

Opportunities for teachers

- The chance to know fewer students well
- The chance to share information and insights about students
- The chance to communicate frequently with a smaller set of parents
- The chance to engage in cooperative planning and teaching
- The chance to experiment with new ideas in teaching
- The chance to take responsibility for the education of fewer students

and possibly follow them through two years
- A greater chance for acknowledging and accommodating individual differences
- More autonomy in curriculum, grading, and discipline
- The assistance of project staff for scheduling, staff development, curriculum development, and training in counseling

Requirements
- Teachers who want to plan and work with a small group of colleagues
- Teachers who are willing to remain with the school for two years
- Increased autonomy for the team in scheduling, curriculum, grading, parental involvement and discipline
- Funding for staff development
- Planning time at least twice a week in addition to the usual preparation period
- Support from administrators for experimentation

The First Step in the Design and Planning Phase

With this research as a stimulus, MK organized informal discussions with teachers from other core subjects, and in November these teachers, with their department chairs, began meeting approximately every week for 35 minutes at lunchtime. Discussion among the interested teachers identified a real need for a more personal approach from the school in addressing the needs of the incoming ninth graders. Consequently, the belief in the advantages of the "coring" concept, of assigning the same students to the same four core subject area teachers, grew. This group of teachers, planning together, could implement many of the afore-mentioned school success strategies in fulfilling the needs of their group of ninth grade students.

The Plan: First year
- Start with a minimum of four teachers, one from each of the core subjects (English, math, social studies, and science), to teach an academically and ethnically random selection of the incoming ninth grade.

These teachers would have five classes in their subject areas and would teach the same corps of students. Teachers in the other subject areas would be encouraged to join the team as scheduling permits.

- Randomly assign 125 to 150 students from the ninth-grade class to represent the usual school population so that there is no discernible difference between this group and the school as a whole.
- Assign one lead teacher, counselor, or administrator to work with this mini-school.
- Organize this school in one building or on one floor or in some other arrangement that keeps them physically close.
- Each teacher becomes the personal advisor for one-quarter of the students and attempts to form a close relationship with each student and their parents.
- Plans should be made for subsequent years. Additional teams could be formed in the ninth grade and /or the ninth grade group could be continued into the tenth grade year with the same students with the same and /or different teachers.

District Encouragement

Throughout these early steps, the Department of Education personnel have been watching the process, wary that toes will be trodden on, yet supportive at the same time. The superintendent for the district has been careful to ensure that everything has been done sensitively, with a view to the possibilities of implementing the same process in other schools in the district.

The district funded the retreat day, and gave a highly supportive talk to the staff. Further, the Superintendant has made available to Suburban High School an extra staff member for the 1989-1990 school year. This extra person will be used to relieve each core teacher of one teaching period per day. Thus the core team will teach only four classes for the next academic year, and will have available each day one common period in which to plan, discuss and modify what they are doing. After the first year, they will revert to the normal class load, but the extra person will remain in the school to support additional cores as they are started.

Expert Input

The Partnership, operating principally through the School Success Project personnel, is responsible for orchestrating a wide range of resources, which are not normally available to this school, to help the school develop its school-based program for renewal.

The School Success Project Conference in January 1989 offered important encouragement for the teachers of Suburban High. John Goodlad's keynote address reinforced the urgency of the need for school renewal, encouraged them, and let them know that they are part of a national movement. The address by a principal and lead teacher from a "core" school in California further encouraged them through the knowledge that others were on the same path. The later workshop with these two gave some practical answers to questions of the Suburban High coring team and other Hawaii conference participants.

All the teachers who have been working on this coring plan have put in many extra hours of their own time. The School Success Project recognizes the need for teachers to be treated as professionals and experts if we expect them to act as such. Therefore, it was believed to be important that all involved teachers were paid for the time they will devote over summer to planning this new move. An application for federal Chapter Two funds, under the innovative schools section, has been prepared and submitted, after a brainstorming session at the school, by the School Success Director, who has a wealth of experience in grant writing,. Thus the school designed the program, but were able to take advantage of another's expert knowledge.

The Kamehameha School/Bishop Estate co-director has some considerable expertise, plus an expert staff, in the area of counseling and guidance. He and his staff have begun meeting with the core teachers to discuss the skills of the "teacher-counselor", an important area to aid the establishment of better interaction between students and teachers.

Renewal of a school requires new ways of looking at and doing things, and is unlikely to succeed if it simply places the old methods and underlying assumptions in a new structure. In March, the four teachers were subsidized to attend a workshop organized by another school district and given by Johnson and Johnson on cooperative learning.

The University Laboratory School, run by CRDG, has long espoused and practiced heterogeneity in the classroom. Over summer, the Suburban High teachers will be working with Laboratory School teachers and other CRDG curriculum specialists in their core subjects, to gain insight into how these specialists work with heterogeneous classes, as well as learning some of the latest curriculum developments. CRDG experts have been developing an inquiry based science program for some years, and the core science teacher is considering adopting this program.

The Center for Youth Research at the University have developed a program for teaching social skills to adolescents, and also have considerable experience in cooperative learning. They, too, will be working with the Suburban High teachers over the summer and during the school year.

Other sources of extraordinary support are being, and will continue to be, sought to enrich and stimulate participating schools and to facilitate the process of school renewal.

A REVIEW OF THE PROJECT AND ITS PROBLEMS

The teachers committed to the coring project are working hard and making good progress. They seem to have the support of much of the remainder of the staff, and their energy and enthusiasm have made a few surprising converts, in particular one staff member who was originally outspoken against any form of intervention in the school. MK has had sabbatical leave approved for the Spring 1989 semester, and is working on his Masters and researching the area. The principal is openly supportive of what is going on and wants to see the coring project expanded in following years.

The School Success Project personnel are pleased with the progress the school has made, and will continue to provide resources and support. However, they do recognize that school renewal is a slow and delicate process, and that it will need to be supported, and encouraged to branch out into wider areas, including those identified by school staff at the retreat day at the beginning of the school year.

It is foolish to assume that any school can ever be fully and completely "renewed". A more reasonable aim is to have the school establish structures which facilitate and encourage a continuing committment to excellent and equitable education for all students, with thoughtful evaluation of current procedures, and the willingness and possibility of making adaptive improvements to the structures as problems are encountered and solutions developed. There are always going to be problems when a new structure is introduced, especially in such a complex organization as a school. Some problems have already been encountered, but many are not yet known, and may involve constraints of space and budget, need for extra time and materials, timetabling, student attitudes, problems of evaluation, and periods of disillusionment for the core team. How the core team identify and solve these and other unanticipated problems will be a critical component in the overall success or failure of this particular, or any, renewal effort.

Beyond the practical problems of change are those concerning policy. There is as yet no clear idea of how this small beginning will be expanded, or if it can be. The school does know that their extra teacher, whose presence frees the core team for planning time in the first year of operation, will continue, but there is not yet a decision about the direction in which coring should develop. Should it be expanded horizontally, remaining a special feature of ninth grade, so that more students next year have the advantage of an easier, more personal transition from intermediate school? Or should it be expanded vertically, so that the original students this year can be followed to tenth grade, and some of the new intake of ninth graders again be selected to participate? Should the ultimate aim be to structure the entire school in this fashion, or the ninth and tenth grade only, or only the ninth grade, or only a smaller section of the school? Should classes all be heterogeneous? How are staff to be assigned? And students? Will the goal of full participation of the

school staff in action research be approached? These are important issues for the school to address if the project is to maintain its energy and enthusiasm.

Being the first school on the island of Oahu to pilot coring also brings with it some problems. Suitable methods of evaluation need to be developed in order that problems are not discounted but recognized and solved before they become insurmountable. The progress of coring in Suburban High will be watched closely by many, critics or supporters, staff and students within the school, parents, personnel from the District and other schools, community decision-makers, the media and others. Progress must be seen realistically rather than viewed through rose colored glasses. Those who are hoping to see dramatic change may become disillusioned and critics may be unjust and destructive in their assessment. It has been said earlier that school-based renewal is a delicate and complex process, and as such it deserves objective and supportive assessment.

Being a pilot school involves a responsibility to share the processes of implementation of successful strategies, and lessons learnt, with other schools. How this information will be disseminated, how successfully, and to how many other schools are all problems still to be addressed.

CONCLUSIONS:

For Suburban High:

The early enthusiasm of the teachers involved, the school administration, the district personnel and the School Success Project personnel is running high, to the point where possible problems and questions have difficulty in rising to the surface and getting proper attention. Much time and effort has been expended, but all concerned are energized rather than depleted by their efforts. A strong sense of camaraderie and professionalism has been developed, particularly among the participating teachers. Certainly they are feeling empowered, able, valuable and responsible to a much higher degree than before. The test, of whether the new structures will affect their students in the same way, will have to be assessed a few years down the track.

For the School Success Project:

For the School Success Project, too, it is very early days. However, although there is no convincing evidence for the success of the project yet, very much indeed has been accomplished since October 1986, and all involved attest to the advantages of the partnership approach to school renewal.

REFERENCES

Clark, Richard W., Heckman, Paul and Wilson, Carol (1988). "National Network for Educational Renewal: Reflections." Work in Progress, Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle.

Goodlad, John I. (1983). A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York.

Goodlad, John I. (1988). The National Network for Educational Renewal: Past, Present, Future, Occasional Paper No. 7, Center for Educational Renewal. College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle.

Oakes, Jeannie (1985). Keeping Track How Schools Structure Inequality, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Plath, Karl R. (1965). Schools Within Schools: A Study of High School Organizations, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Purkey, William W. and Novak, John M. (1984). Inviting School Success: A Self-Concept Approach to Teaching and Learning, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, CA.

Ramsey, Robert D. (1967). The Schools Within a School, Parker Publishing Company, Inc., West Nyack, New York.